

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/807,664	07/05/2001	Wolfgang Becker	H3624PCT/US	2217	
23657 75	90 09/24/2003				
COGNIS COR			EXAMINER		
	2500 RENAISSANCE BLVD., SUITE 200 GULPH MILLS, PA 19406		HOWARD, JACQUELINE V		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1764		

DATE MAILED: 09/24/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			A.S
-	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/807,664 BECKER ET AL.		
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jacqueline V. Howard	1764	
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap	pears on the cover sheet wit	th the correspondence add	iress
THE REPLY FILED 22 August 2003 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Apple Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	avoid abandonment of this (1) a timely filed amendmen	application. A proper repl nt which places the applica	ly to a ation in
PERIOD FOR I	REPLY [check either a) or b)]	
a) The period for reply expires <u>4</u> months from the mailing d	date of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of thin no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expiron ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY W 706.07(f).	re later than SIX MONTHS from th	e mailing date of the final reject	ion.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). T fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the periof fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the C timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 3	od of extension and the correspond of the shortened statutory period f Office later than three months after	ling amount of the fee. The app for reply originally set in the final	ropriate extension Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellar 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 C			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered	l because:		
(a) they raise new issues that would require fur	ther consideration and/or se	earch (see NOTE below);	
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note	e below);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	n in better form for appeal b	y materially reducing or si	mplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without canc	celing a corresponding numb	per of finally rejected claim	าร.
NOTE:			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reje			
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) wou canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	uld be allowable if submitted	in a separate, timely filed	l amendment
5.⊠ The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request application in condition for allowance because:		n considered but does NC	T place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered b raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ecause it is not directed SO	LELY to issues which wer	re newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendme explanation of how the new or amended claims			and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follow	/s:		
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			

Jacqueline V. Howard **Primary Examiner** Art Unit: 1764

10. Other: ____

Claim(s) rejected: 11-28.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

8. The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.

9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: no amendments have been made to the claims and the arguments presented to traverse the final rejection are not persuasive of error in the rejection. They repeat the arguments addressed by the examiner in the last office action. The consisting essentially of language of claim 25 would not render the claims patentable since patentee does not teach he has to have a mixture of fatty acid esters which includes animal oil. The reference provides for the presence of methyl esters of the same vegetable oils as in the instant claims. The examiner maintains the position set forth in the final rejection.

JACOJELINE V. HOWARI PRIMARY EXAMINER GROUP 1**7**00